



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,275	10/10/2003	Martin B. Bushman	INTCOM.001A	7516

20995 7590 11/09/2007  
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP  
2040 MAIN STREET  
FOURTEENTH FLOOR  
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER
----------

FERTIG, BRIAN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

4124

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/09/2007

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com  
eOAPilot@kmob.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/679,275	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BUSHMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Brian Fertig	<b>Art Unit</b> 4124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/8/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/8/2005</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The Appendix to the specification is not a proper information disclosure. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, identification of their respective authorship, publisher, date, and location of publication. The Appendix appears to be a document separate from the specification. Inclusion of the Appendix on the Information Disclosure Statement is required.

### ***Specification***

2. Claims 1 and 2 are objected to because of the following informalities:

#### With respect to claim 1

Claim 1 recites 'the procedure' of the certificate authority, 'the signed digital document', 'the signer', and 'the transfer'. These references find no antecedent basis within the claims. Additionally, the second recital of 'a copy of the signed payment authorization' is ambiguous as it is not clear whether it refers to the first recital or whether it is meant to invoke a new document. For the purpose of examination below, it is assumed that these references are to their original recitations.

#### With respect to claim 2

Claim 2 recites repeated references to 'a first' and 'a second' financial institution and 'an account'. It is not clear as to whether these references refer to their original recitations or whether these are new instances of financial

institutions and accounts. For the purpose of examination below, it is assumed that these are references refer to their original recitations.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,465,206 to Hilt, 1995 (Hilt).

With respect to claim 2

Hilt teaches:

A secure messaging system (Bill Pay System see Abstract) for supporting financial transactions with finality between a first client (Consumer C e.g. 12, see col 12, line 51) having an account at a first financial institution (Bank C e.g. 16, see col 12, line 52) and a second client (Biller B e.g. 14, see col 12, lines 51-52) having an account at a second financial institution (Bank B e.g. 18, see col 12, line 52), the secure messaging system comprising:

a transfer network system (Payment Network e.g. 102, see col 12, line 53) comprising a messaging server (Clearing Subsystem e.g. 106 see

col 13, see lines 20-21 and col 16, lines 4-9) configured to send and receive messages from a communications medium (Links see col 4, lines 12 - 15) and further comprising an audit database (Transaction Logger e.g. 164, see col 16, lines 41-43);

a first client system (personal computer see Col 7, Lines 23 – 28) connected to the transfer network system via the communications medium, the first client system being associated with the first client;  
a second client system (customer general ledger, col 4, lines 49-57, note the ledger is understood to be on a computing medium as it includes a database updated from a system having read a MICR encoded check) connected to the transfer network system via the communications medium, the second client system being associated with the second client;

a validation server (card reader e.g. 322, see col 22, lines 18-27) in communication with the transfer network system, the validation server configured to provide authentication of the identity of at least one individual user of the first client having authority to assent to the payment of funds from an account of the first client to an account of the second client,

a first financial institution client system (Bank C see col 12, lines 53 - 58) connected to the transfer network system via the communications medium and associated with a first financial institution, the first financial institution having an account holding funds of the first client;

a second financial institution client system (Bank B see col 12, lines 53 - 58) connected to the transfer network system via the communications medium and associated with a second financial institution, the second financial institution having an account holding funds of the second client.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,292,789 to Schutzer, September, 2001 (Schutzer) in view of *Control Principles and Role Hierarchies* by J.D. Moffett, ACM, 1998 (Moffett).

With respect to claim 1

Schutzer teaches:

A method for finalizing an electronic fund transfer that is matched to an invoice for payment to be made from a first party (consumer 100, see col 14, lines 18-25) having a financial account at a first bank (consumer payment processor 138, see col 14, lines 18-25) to a second party (Biller 106, see col 14, lines 18-29) having a financial account at a second bank (biller payment processor 142, see col 14, lines 18-25) using a network transfer system (collectively consumer service provider 102, payment processor 156, and tracking entity 154, see col 15, lines 3-36) that is in electronic communication (computer network, see Abstract) with the first party, the second party, the first bank and the second bank, the method comprising:

- generating at the first party a document which authorizes the payment of the invoice (electronic mail with payment instructions, see col 15, lines 3-6);

- signing the document using a first digital certificate in accordance with the procedure of a certificate authority in electronic communication with the transfer network system (sending a digitally signed electronic mail with payment instruction, see col 15, lines 4-6);

- sending the signed digital document from the first party to the network transfer system electronically (sending a digitally

signed electronic mail with a payment instruction to his or her payment processor, see col 15 lines 4-6);

authenticating via the certificate authority the authority of the signer of the signed document to assent to payment of the invoice (the payment processor decrypts and authenticates the payment instruction, see col 15, lines 20-21);

storing a copy of the signed digital document in a database associated with the transfer network system (the consumer service provider logs the request, see col 20, lines 6-8);

sending a copy of the signed payment authorization request to the first bank (The consumer service provider processes payment through its consumer payment processor, see col 14, lines 21-23);

creating an electronic payment instruction verifying the transfer of funds out of the financial account of the first party at the first bank (The consumer payment processor . . . may provide optional status reporting, see col 14, lines 21-23);

sending this electronic payment instruction from the first bank to the transfer network system (The payment processor acknowledges that it has submitted the payment for processing back to the appropriate tracking entity, see col 15, lines 23-25);



forwarding the electronic payment instruction to the second bank (The consumer payment processor clears and settles payment, see col 14, lines 21-22);

creating an electronic payment receipt verifying the transfer of funds into the financial account of the second party at the second bank (the payment processor acknowledges receipt of funds, see col 15, lines 27-28); and

sending the electronic payment receipt from the second bank to the transfer network system (the payment processor acknowledges receipt of funds to the tracking entity, see co 15, lines 27-29).

Schutzer does not explicitly teach:

sending a payment authorization request from the network transfer system to the first party;

signing of the payment authorization request using a second digital certificate in accordance with the procedure of the certificate authority;

sending the signed payment authorization request from the first party to the network transfer system electronically;

authenticating via the certificate authority the authority of the signer of the signed payment authorization request to assent to the transfer of funds from the financial account of the first party at the

first bank to the financial account of the second party at the second bank;

storing a copy of the signed payment authorization request in the database associated with the transfer network system.

Moffett teaches:

sending a payment authorization request from the network transfer system (system) to the first party (i.e. the business transacting their payment process on the system. Note the Account Supervisor, acting as a representative for the first party, approves the Accounts Payable after Accounts Payable Clerk, also acting as a representative for the first party, has prepared the payment authorization by inputting details of the invoices into the system, see sec 4.1 pg 66 and fig 5. Note also, that it is inherent that the Accounts Payable document be sent to the Account Supervisor's screen for review and approval);

signing of the payment authorization request using a second digital certificate in accordance with the procedure of the certificate authority (i.e. Account Supervisor approves Accounts Payable, see pg 66. Note that a signature is a well known form of signifying approval. Note also that this is a repetition of a step already taught by Schutzer that produces no unexpected results);

sending the signed payment authorization request from the first party to the network transfer system electronically (Supervisor releases Accounts Payable for payment. Note, it is implicit that the payment authorization is released back to the system and Fig 5 indicates that a computer system is used to store data. Further note that in Accounts Payable Review, 'digital signatures' are discussed as being the equivalent of an ink signature. Note also that this is a repetition of a step already taught by Schutzer that produces no unexpected results. Note too that the difference in documents – i.e. signed payment authorization v signed payment authorization request - would also have no effect on the operation of the method);

authenticating via the certificate authority the authority of the signer of the signed payment authorization request to assent to the transfer of funds from the financial account of the first party at the first bank to the financial account of the second party at the second bank (Note this is a repetition of the step already taught by Schutzer that produces no unexpected results.);

storing a copy of the signed payment authorization request in the database associated with the transfer network system (Note that this is a repetition of the step already taught by Schutzer that produces no unexpected results. Note too that the difference in

documents – i.e. signed payment authorization v signed payment authorization request - would also have no effect on the operation of the method.) all in order to achieve separation of duties and decentralization motivated by control theory (see pg 64).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have provided the method for finalizing an electronic fund transfer taught by Schutzer with the control principle motivated steps of Moffett in order to achieve a separation of duties and decentralization as taught explicitly by Moffett (see pg 64).

### ***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Fertig whose telephone number is (571) 270-5131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30am to 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Bomberg can be reached on (571) 272-4922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 4124

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

-bf

/Kenneth Bomberg/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4124